D1G9JOHS 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 V. 11 CR 0487 (RJS) 5 JOHN JOHNSON, 6 Defendant. 7 ----x 8 New York, N.Y. January 16, 2013 9 4:42 p.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. RICHARD J. SULLIVAN 12 District Judge 13 14 APPEARANCES 15 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 16 TODD BLANCHE 17 NOLA HELLER Assistant United States Attorneys 18 DAVID S. GREENFIELD 19 JAMES NEUMAN Attorneys for Defendant 20 21 22 23 24 25

(In open court; case called)

MR. BLANCHE: Good afternoon, your Honor.

Todd Blanche for the government. With me at counsel table is AUSA Nola Heller and FBI special agent Rachel Kolvek.

THE COURT: Good afternoon to each of you.

For the defendant.

MR. GREENFIELD: Good afternoon.

David Greenfield for John Johnson. And also seated at counsel table is Jim Neuman, an associate of mine. We're in the same suite of offices.

I would like to propose that Mr. Neuman be assigned by the court for purpose of assisting me during the course of the appellate process in this case. We worked often on other cases before. He's familiar with the facts of this case. He, in fact, has helped me pro bono for the motion practice and is aware of a number of the issues.

So he's on the CJA panel. I've discussed this -- in other cases we've worked together similarly. But particularly in this case, Judge, I've just been assigned two death eligible cases within the last month. Both in stage one of the proceedings. And my time is going to be unfortunately put more toward that than to the appellate process. And for all those reasons, I would ask the court to appoint Jim Neuman as an associate for the purpose of the appeal in this case.

THE COURT: And he would then be compensated at the

welcome here.

22

23

24

25

I want to thank you for taking the time to be here. I'm sure it means a great deal to Mr. Johnson.

Some of you wrote letters to the court and I've read

those letters. Thank you for taking the time to do that.

Mr. Blanche, you indicated that the victim's mother and perhaps others wish to speak on behalf of the victim?

MR. BLANCHE: Ms. Garcia is here and would like to address the court. She's here with other friends and family. And then I have a letter that I've been asked to read into the record at an appropriate time from Mr. Garcia's sister.

THE COURT: Welcome to all of you as well. Some I have seen before. Others not. Thank you for being here. The victims have a right to speak in a court proceedings and so, obviously, we'll allow that to take place. And then the letter that Mr. Blanche referred to, I'll certainly allow him to read that into the record as well.

We're here for sentencing. Mr. Johnson was convicted at trial on the three counts of the indictment by a jury.

Mr. Greenfield, on Mr. Johnson's behalf has filed motions under Rule 29 and Rule 33. Those motions are denied. So sentencing is what remains.

I want to go over with the parties what I've reviewed in connection with sentencing, and then if there's anything that I've over looked, by all means, let me know.

I was the presiding judge at trial so I'm familiar with what took place at the trial. I've reviewed the transcript in parts.

I've also reviewed the presentence report prepared by

the probation department. It's dated November 29. It is a 19-page, single-spaced report. It also includes a recommendation by the probation officer.

I have reviewed Mr. Greenfield's sentencing memorandum which is a six-page, double-spaced memorandum. In addition, it includes attachment, a letter from Mr. Johnson's grandmother who raised him, some of the time raised him. And just yesterday I received a letter from Jenecca Williams, who is Mr. Johnson's cousin. I've reviewed that letter as well.

Then I have reviewed the government's sentencing memorandum which is a twelve-page, double-spaced submission dated January 10.

And I think that's really it in connection with sentencing.

So is there anything else that should be part of the record that I've not referenced?

MR. BLANCHE: Not from the government.

THE COURT: Mr. Greenfield?

MR. GREENFIELD: I'm not aware of anything.

THE COURT: Well then let's start with the presentence report.

Mr. Greenfield, you've received a copy of the presentence report?

MR. GREENFIELD: Indeed I have, your Honor. I've reviewed it on a number of occasions with my client. We have

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

no objections at this time to whatever is in the report.

THE COURT: To what's in the report. Obviously, you dispute the jury's verdict and you've made it clear you intend to appeal, as is your right. But with respect to the findings I've set forth and the guidelines calculation set forth in the presentence report, you have no objection?

MR. GREENFIELD: That's correct.

THE COURT: Mr. Blanche, you have reviewed the presentence report as well?

MR. BLANCHE: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You and Ms. Heller.

And do you have any objection to anything in it?

MR. BLANCHE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Well Mr. Johnson let's start with the presentence report. And one of the things that we'll focus on for a few minutes is the sentencing guidelines application in this case. I'm sure Mr. Greenfield has explained to you the sentencing guidelines.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: To some extent. Right.

And others here may be less familiar with the sentencing guidelines. So let me tell you what they are and how they work.

The sentencing guidelines are a big book that is put out by a commission. The commission is called the United

States Sentencing Commission. And it's made up of judges and experts in the field, lawyers primarily. They are tasked with putting out this book each year. And certain changes are made on a yearly basis.

But the way it works is as follows. Every crime or type of crime is covered by a chapter or a subchapter in this book. And a judge is directed then to go to the book, go to the appropriate chapter, and make certain factual findings and, on the basis of those findings, points are assigned. So the court goes through the process of adding and subtracting points. And then at the end of that comes up with a number. That number is referred to as the offense level.

There then is a separate calculation done under a different chapter in the book that's referred to as the criminal history category. Not surprisingly, a person who has previously been convicted of crime, a person who has previously gone to jail for other crimes is treated more harshly than a person who has no prior convictions. Again, the judge goes to that chapter, makes findings about whether there were prior convictions; if so, when they were, for how long, whether the defendant committed this crime while on supervision for that —for those other crimes. In any event, it's a mathematical process. The court adds and subtracts and comes up with another number.

There are six criminal history categories. One is the

lowest, the least serious. Six is the highest and the most serious. So the court selects which is the appropriate criminal history category, one through six.

And then on the basis of those two findings, the offense level on the one hand and the criminal history category on the other, the court is directed to make a finding as to what is the appropriate range of sentence according to this book.

And if you go to the back of the book, there's a table. And it's very straightforward. One axis, one part of the book, the table in the book relates to the offense level and the other axis going across reflects the criminal history category. And the spot on the chart where those two meet is the range that, according to the commission that prepares this book, would be appropriate under the circumstances.

Now, judges are not required to follow this manual. We don't have to slavishly adhere to it. But judges are required to consider this manual and to make findings and to decide what the range is.

After that, a judge is required to consider a variety of other factors. And I might as well say what those are now, but we'll be talking about them, I'm sure, at some length.

Those other factors include the defendant's personal history. Mr. Johnson's a complicated person, like everyone is, and so he has an entire life that has to be considered by the

court. So I will look to the circumstances of his birth and childhood, his upbringing, his educational background, his work history, his criminal history, his family relationships today and throughout his life, all the things that make him who he is; good, bad. Everybody is complicated. So the court is required to consider the whole person.

In addition, the court is required to consider the facts and circumstances of this crime or these crimes. This is a very serious crime. Resulted in the death of another human being. So that's about as serious as a crime can get.

But it's not just what the label of the crime is.

It's the details of the crime. What Mr. Johnson did. What the jury found that he did. What I will find that he did. And what others did relative to him. And the Court is required to really focus on the particular details of the crime.

The goal is to fashion a sentence that reflects the seriousness of the crime and that promotes respect for the law and that provides a just punishment for the crime.

So that's very, very important. The court looks to the circumstances of the crime that's involved.

In addition, the court has to consider the need to deter or discourage the defendant, Mr. Johnson, and others from committing crimes in the future. And if you think of it this way, one of the objectives of the sentencing is to send a message to the individual defendant but also to a wider public

so that people understand that these types of crimes just won't be tolerated. And, hopefully, Mr. Johnson and others will see that there is such a cost to this conduct that they will never commit crimes like this again. And that other people will not commit them in the first place. And the hope is that there will be fewer crimes like this because of the sentence imposed in this case. It would have a deterrent effect or a discouraging effect.

Now it's sometimes hard to know what the effect of a sentence will be and how broadly it will be felt. But Congress has found -- and I think most of us understand intuitively that there's something to that, that there is a message that gets sent by a sentence and that that's a legitimate objective of sentencing. So I'll factor that in as well.

Other factors that I have to consider are

Mr. Johnson's own needs while he's in custody. So to the

extent he has medical needs or mental health needs or substance

abuse treatment needs, the need for educational opportunities,

vocational training, all of those things are properly

considered by the court in fashioning an appropriate sentence

so that when he's released, if, in fact, he's -- doesn't

receive a life sentence, that he would have skills and the

ability to live productively when he gets out. So that's

another factor I have to consider.

Another factor I have to consider is the need to avoid

1 dispari

disparity between the sentence imposed in this case and the sentence imposed on other people in this case or in other cases that are similarly situated.

The point is it would be unfair if a person does much more time or much less time than other people who did basically the same thing simply because of who the judge was or because of who the lawyers were. The goal is to have rough equality so that the people who have done the same thing with similar criminal histories are treated roughly the same.

If that were not the case, if it was arbitrary or if a certain judge were -- judges were real really, really tough, others very, very lenient and it all just turned on who the judge happened to be, people would lose respect for that system. They would wonder whether this was fair system. So courts are required to take into account what others have received or would receive in similar circumstances. So, the hard part for me is to balance all of those things.

The guidelines are one factor. And we're going to talk about the guidelines in a moment. But the other factors are also important, and we'll talk about those. Mr. Greenfield has talked about those in his submission. The government has as well.

So we'll start, Mr. Greenfield, with the presentence report and the guidelines. And I don't think there's any dispute about what the guidelines are in this case.

In this case, because of the nature of the crime, the fact that another person was killed, the base offense level is level 43. That's the highest level under the guidelines.

That's pursuant to section 2A1.1.

The criminal history category that applies here turns on the fact that Mr. Johnson has prior convictions from 2007 and 2008, both for criminal possession of a controlled substance in the Bronx, each of which resulted in 30 days imprisonment. There is also another 2008 — there's a 2009 conviction for conduct that was in 2008, also in the Bronx, related to the criminal sale of a controlled substance. That resulted in a one-year sentence. And then there was a criminal trespassing charge that Mr. Johnson pled guilty to in 2009. That resulted in three days of custody.

According to the presentence report -- and I think there is no objection, that is five criminal history points.

Now, was Mr. Johnson on supervised release or parole at the time the instant offense was committed?

MR. BLANCHE: No, your Honor, I don't believe he was. But I believe Mr. -- we should have brought this up earlier, but Mr. Greenfield indicated that the conviction in paragraph 42 for criminal trespassing should, under the guidelines, not result in any criminal history points. I believe that was in Mr. Greenfield's submission. And the government doesn't dispute that. So I believe that Mr. Johnson has five criminal

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
1 history points -- I'm sorry, four criminal history points.
```

THE COURT: Okay. So four criminal history points or five criminal history points puts him in criminal history category III. So it doesn't really make a difference for purposes of the guideline calculation.

MR. BLANCHE: Agreed.

THE COURT: But the parties agree that paragraph 42 should be amended to indicate no criminal history points?

MR. BLANCHE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. GREENFIELD: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: But the question I had so at the time of the robbery and the shooting, Mr. Johnson was not under any kind of supervision from the state court system?

MR. GREENFIELD: That's my understanding.

MR. BLANCHE: Correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Based then on a criminal history category of III and offense level of 43, the sentence recommended or directed under the guidelines is a life sentence. So, that's the guidelines. There are other factors, of course, that I have to consider.

So Mr. Greenfield, I'm happy to hear from you.

MR. GREENFIELD: Do I go before the victim impact statement or after?

THE COURT: I don't think there's any required way to do it.

1 Does anybody have a preference? 2 Mr. Blanche. MR. GREENFIELD: The only time -- Judge, the only time 3 4 I've been involved with that, it preceded my presentation, so I 5 can possibly comment on it. 6 THE COURT: I will give you an opportunity to comment 7 regardless. But that's fine, if Mr. Garcia's mother would like to address the court now. 8 9 MR. BLANCHE: Address the court now? 10 THE COURT: Yes. 11 MR. BLANCHE: Does your Honor want her to speak at the 12 lecturn? 13 THE COURT: At the lecturn would be great if you could 14 keep your voice up and state your name and spell your name for 15 the record. 16 MS. GARCIA: My name is Evlyn Garcia. 17 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Garcia, good to see you. 18 I saw you previously and you testified at trial. So thank you 19 for being here today. 20 MS. GARCIA: Thank you for having me. 21 I was supposed to write something. I started to 22 several times. I just couldn't because what really could I say 23 to what he did to my son. I don't know. I said maybe when I 24 saw him I would know what to say. 25 What I did want to say was what kind of kid my son

was. My son was a very good boy. He was only 16. He was very loved by all his family. He might have started hanging out with his friends and been at the wrong place waiting for whatever he was doing there. But despite all of that, my son didn't have a weapon. My son didn't charge at the defendant. My son didn't -- he was actually on the floor picking up quarters from playing, from shooting quarters with his friend. He was on the ground and he went and shot my son despite that he -- you know, my son couldn't defend himself. And how does a person shoot a 16-year-old young boy?

I have a hole in my heart. It will never be covered. My daughter, she's been a mess. She's going to school. Thank God she's graduating soon. I have two boys over there who are raised — who are being raised without their brother. They were eight and ten when he died. I have a whole entire family who misses my son. He was very charismatic. He was the joker of the family.

And you know what he did here, he destroyed two families here because I'm pretty sure he destroyed his family who are not going to have him around. And he destroyed my family who I'm never going to see my baby ever again. My son would have been 21 right now, maybe in college. And that's just not going to happen. And I'm never going to see him again. And it's not fair because that was my baby. He was my firstborn son. He was even born in a special way. I had him

at home. I didn't even get to get to the hospital.

He was just very special. He would do so many things for me. I had seven stomach surgeries and my son took care of me every single time. He would help me bathe. He would help me dress. He was always there for me. He defended me to the end. Anybody who would say anything about me, he always defended me. He was my right-hand. He was my little buddy because at the time my other two boys, they were very young. He was 16. He was -- my daughter was away in college. He was the one who would spend the nights up with me watching TV. He used to make chocolate covered strawberries for me. I will never have that again.

I just wanted to know why. Why would he shoot my son?

If he is allowed to even answer that. I've waited five years,

one month, and fifteen days to understand and know why my son

is dead. Because I don't understand it.

My son was picking up quarters from the ground. He didn't -- I don't understand -- I don't understand. I don't know why he would shoot my son, and I would really, if he is allowed to speak.

THE COURT: Mr. Johnson will have the right to speak if he wants to but he's not required to, and no one can make him answer that question, if there is an answer to that question, I don't know. But it's a question that everyone is wondering and the reality may be there is no answer to that

question. But that doesn't make it any easier. I agree.

MS. GARCIA: In conclusion, I just want to say that you know what he did, a lot of kids are doing this. It's not fair. Destroys families. Destroys people.

My family has never been the same. I have an uncle, the one who raised me, who was like my father, who raised my son as well. That was the love of his life. And my uncle died very soon after him of sadness. He couldn't take the pain, the loss of my son. I became an alcoholic. I was in and out of rehabs for two years. I gave my kids away to my mother for two years because I became a hateful person. I didn't care about no one.

Thank God I got my life together, and I got my children back, and I moved, and I even went back to school trying to be a better person.

But I still -- my life is never going to be complete because I don't have my son with me. And I just want you to know that you destroyed my life by that action that you did. And that's all I have to say.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mrs. Garcia. I appreciate it.

MS. GARCIA: Thank you for listening.

THE COURT: Mr. Greenfield.

MR. GREENFIELD: I thought a letter was going to be read.

THE COURT: Let's do that then as well.

MR. BLANCHE: This is a letter from Maria Garcia which is the victim's older sister, your Honor.

My brother. Although he was two years younger than me was like my twin. Because we looked identical. He was a jokester. Sweet and funny. I found out I was pregnant with my daughter the same week you killed my brother. And I never got to tell him that. Luckily, my mother told him behind my back. And, thank God, my daughter came out looking and acting just like him. How dare you think that you could have gotten away with this. I hope you live a miserable life knowing that you not only took an innocent kid's life but that you've hurt so many people as well. Tinkey's family and friends miss him so much. We've waited four-and-a-half long years and I'm glad justice has finally been served.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. GREENFIELD: May I proceed?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. GREENFIELD: I don't know how long we've known each other, Judge, but I — it's been a while. But I've been doing this for 46 years now, and I have to say this is probably the most difficult sentencing that I have ever been involved in for a number of reasons. And I mean to hear a mother's grief like I just heard and to hear a sister's grief like I just heard, it's hard to follow. But the fact that a life was lost

is clearly a tragedy.

But in fashioning a sentence and arguing for my client here today, Judge, I want to do the best I can for him to assure that a near tragedy doesn't occur with respect to him. There are, as the court heard during the course of trial, there are some significant issues as to whether or not he truly was the individual who was a young black man who shot Bernardo Garcia. There's significant issues about that that will be dealt with on appeal. I'm not going to retry the case now, Judge, I don't intend to. Try to avoid retrying the case now. But there were significant hard issues as to whether or not he was the young black man in the hallway that day who pulled the trigger that killed Bernardo Garcia.

I understand the PSR is calling for a life sentence.

I understand the government is asking for it. But I respectfully suggest to your Honor that under the facts of the case, as to the involvement of the young black man -- young black kid, I think it was actually, that was referred to in the FBI reports initially describing the shooter, there's a significant issue as to whether or not he is that individual.

THE COURT: Look, Mr. Greenfield. I know those arguments — those are best left for the appeal, obviously. But the jury found him guilty. And so I'm going to sentence him based on that finding. I don't think it was irrational for the jury to reach that conclusion.

So, you argued in your letter, or you suggested that there's sort of -- tenuous nature of the evidence implicating Mr. Johnson is sort of -- should be a relevant factor as to what is the appropriate sentence.

Is that right? Do I have that right?

MR. GREENFIELD: It was overstated, Judge. I understand. He was convicted by a jury. He must stand sentenced now. The individual who committed the crime, whether — let me withdraw that last statement.

He must be sentenced now because the jury found him guilty. Understood.

Looking at the facts of the case as I heard them during the course of the trial, and taking into consideration the factors under 3553(a) that the Court must consider in meting out sentence in this case, I think a sentence of a nonlife sentence is called for in this case. And if the court will allow.

THE COURT: I definitely want to hear you. I will allow it anyway, but you have a right to make those arguments so by all means go ahead.

MR. GREENFIELD: What you have here is a robbery that was hastily planned by the government witness Donnell Richardson. He brought in his two friends, according to Donnell Richardson, Mr. Reed and Mr. Gonzalez, to help in the course of a robbery.

According to Donnell Richardson there was no violence that was intended to occur during the course of that robbery. But it was merely just to scare the individuals in the hallway so Richardson could take over the drug operation in which Mr. Garcia and another individual were involved.

Apparently at the last second Reed recruits somebody described by Mr. Richardson, initially described by Mr. Richardson as a young black kid. And that person was brought in as a second gun during the course of the robbery.

Reed enters the hallway where the drug operation is located. And he enters firing his weapon apparently.

Apparently the gun goes off in the hand of the second individual, the young black kid, and Mr. Garcia is shot and unfortunately passes away.

The only witness to the murder is Garcia's -- actually in the hallway is Garcia's compatriot who is working. That compatriot doesn't give a description about the shooter at all. He just says he believed he's black. Couldn't even give a full clothing description much less a description of the individual.

But clearly, according to both Richardson and the individual in the hallway, the young black kid was not the planner of the robbery, was not the leader of the crew, was brought in at the last second. And apparently, according to the government's proof here, the gun might have gone off accidentally or unintentionally. That's how I heard the proof

during the course of the trial. That's how I heard it coming in. The gun was discharged during the course of the robbery.

THE COURT: No question about that.

MR. GREENFIELD: Sorry, Judge?

THE COURT: No question about that. The gun was discharged during the course of the robbery.

MR. GREENFIELD: And sadly, Bernardo Garcia was hit by that discharged weapon.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. GREENFIELD: It seemed clear to me -- and maybe the court sees it differently -- but there was no intent for anybody to get shot during the course of that robbery. There was no intent for anybody to be killed during the course of that robbery.

THE COURT: Well I mean it's distinguishable from a premeditated murder situation where someone is planning for days, hours, weeks, to actually kill another person.

But it's a felony murder, a robbery with guns that led to the death of another individual.

MR. GREENFIELD: The government could have chosen to charge the count any way they wanted to, the murder count. They chose to charge it as a 924(j), which gives the Court the greatest discretion in sentencing of any count charging murder. The sentence can go anywhere from probation all the way up to life on a 924(j).

But clearly the government chose that count because I would assume they weren't sure whether it was an intentional shooting or not, if it was meant to be an intentional shooting. Clearly their witnesses don't indicate that it was intended to occur. But clearly a shooting took place during the course of a robbery and a death followed. Under the state law system that's a felony murder.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. GREENFIELD: I'm not arguing the fact that it's not a murder, Judge. I'm arguing the fact that whoever that young black kid was, and if indeed it was John Johnson, didn't enter there with the thought of committing a murder. Something went wrong and a death occurred.

Now the Court, because of that, has to mete out, fashion a sentence. And I don't envy you the job in this case, Judge. I don't.

THE COURT: It doesn't pay much either but it is what it is.

So, look, I yesterday imposed a life sentence on Mr. Reed. There are differences between Mr. Reed and Mr. Johnson. Differences in terms of age. Differences in terms of criminal history. Differences in terms of I think responsibility for planning the robbery. But also differences in terms of who pulled the trigger that killed Mr. Garcia.

MR. GREENFIELD: Clearly.

THE COURT: So I think at some point it's worth addressing those differences. I don't want to take you out of the order you were pursuing.

MR. GREENFIELD: Actually, I was at the point where I was going to go through the 3553(a) factors.

Start with, before we even get to that, if, in fact, he was the individual -- and all my comments about the crime itself is he denied it. So I don't want it to have anybody say that I am acknowledging his involvement because he certainly never did that to me.

Certainly the crime was the brainchild of the government's witness, Donnell Richardson, a career criminal who has had many opportunities to go straight and narrow in the past and always went far and wide instead.

He recruited somebody who he says was a past partner in crime, Mr. Reed, and apparently a past partner in crime in Mr. Gonzalez also. But they're the ones who talked about this robbery. They're the ones who planned the robbery. And the young black individual who was the second gun was not a party to that at all. He certainly did not think to — he didn't even know that there was drugs being sold in that hallway, whoever that young black was, prior to the time he went into the hallway.

Clearly it was a crime of Richardson. Clearly it was being carried out by Reed. And if my client was there, other

than the fact that he's apparently the person who pulled the trigger, he was not a leader, a manager, or in any way somebody who put this deal together, this unfortunate, terrible incident that happened.

His life, to begin with, was a shambles. His mother basically abandoned him almost at birth. He grew up in a foster home system. His maternal grandmother who is -- excuse me paternal grandmother who is now living in the Carolinas -- North Carolina, I believe it is, can't be here today, raised him almost from the toddler stage until he was a teenager. And she raised him to be, according to her letter, a fine, respectable man.

His father, who he has maintained a good relationship with, over the years had another home where he had other children. But he always was there for his son. He was here everyday during the course of trial. He's here today in the audience. And he's with his son day in and day out, at least in spirit.

His aunt is also here, lived with his grandmother and helped raise him too.

He worked in his father's business, which is a paper goods business, for many years, while he was attending school and while he was out of school, actually. He worked for his father for a good three or four years as far as I know.

At the time of his arrest he was working for a caterer

located in Central Park, one of the pavilions in Central Park, and had worked there for over a year on a steady basis.

He has no violence in his background whatsoever. If anything, he enjoyed smoking marijuana a little bit too much and that got him involved in street level drug distribution.

He has a son who I believe is six years old -- six years old now who he helped raise, who is being raised by his grandmother now down in North Carolina. His son lived with him until his arrest in this case and with his grandmother. His grandmother, as I said, moved down to North Carolina almost after the -- a few days after the trial ended.

A picture emerges of him, I think, of somebody who came up in tough circumstances and did as much as he could under the circumstances growing up where he grew up to try to make a life for himself. His grandmother's letter shows what a decent — what she considers him to be, a decent self-respecting — a decent respectful person.

His cousin, Jenecca Williams, wrote a, I thought, very touching letter which I sent to the court yesterday, speaks of him in glowing terms, saying how devastated she is by the circumstances here.

Mrs. Garcia had it right. Two families are crushed here. The loss of her son, he'll never be replaced. My concern -- my concern for him is he's 24-years-old. His record other than drug sale is minimal. He has a good relationship

with his family. He worked when he could. He's got a son who loves him. And I don't believe a life sentence is called for here, Judge.

yesterday. And he's not the kind of guy you see very often in here charged with violent crimes. I think, given a sentence of 20 years, the interests of justice would be well served. And I believe, based on the guy I've gotten to know over the course of this case -- and I've gotten to know him, spent a lot of time with him and respectful is the right word when you describe him. He is a -- just a -- I won't say -- he's a good person to sit with and talk. I mean it's -- sometimes I don't want to go to the MCC or MDC to see who I have to see. I've never felt that way about seeing my client. It was always a good time being spent both in going forward with the case and also talking to somebody who I knew was listening to what I was saying and was taking what I was saying to heart when we spoke.

Judge, I can only -- and I respectfully suggest to your Honor that a life sentence is not called for. I respectfully suggest, your Honor, to your Honor that 20 years will serve the interests of justice and yet after that 20 years I don't think the criminal justice system will ever see John Johnson again. I think when he comes out he will go ahead and lead a law-abiding life. And I would ask the court to impose a sentence of 20 years. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Greenfield.

Mr. Blanche.

MR. BLANCHE: Thank you, your Honor.

Your Honor, in the government's view one of the most telling things about the presentation from Mr. Johnson is an incredible lack of acceptance of responsibility. And what I mean by that is not once during the argument that your Honor — that the Court just heard did Mr. Greenfield refer to Mr. Johnson as the shooter. What he did was he referred to Mr. Johnson's view that was put forward at trial which is that there was a young black kid who killed Bernardo Garcia.

Your Honor, that's not what happened. I mean the person that murdered and killed Bernardo Garcia is Mr. Johnson, John Johnson.

THE COURT: I'm going to sentence him based on that.

Are you suggesting I should sentence him to more basically because he hasn't given up his right to appeal by not admitting that?

MR. BLANCHE: Absolutely not. I'm not suggesting that Mr. Johnson has to accept responsibility or owes Ms. Garcia an explanation as to why he murdered her son. But on the other hand, when Mr. Johnson stands in front of your Honor and asks for mercy, and asks for a nonguidelines sentence, and says you shouldn't impose a sentence that the guidelines call for, I'm different than Mr. Reed, the Court has too ask, in the

government's view: Why? How are you different? How do I know that if I impose a sentence less than life you're going to lead a law-abiding life? Or you're going to show that you've earned something less than a life sentence?

There are a couple -- well there's several ways that the Court could perhaps -- what the Court could look to to find that. One is any showing of remorse.

And he doesn't have to show remorse, your Honor. He doesn't have to accept responsibility. But it's telling that he, on the one hand, refuses to accept any remorse, any responsibility, any explanation for this crime. But on the other hand says that he will not have further contact with the justice system. He will lead a law-abiding life if he's sentenced to something less than life. And I do — the government does believe that that's a factor that the Court should consider.

Mr. Greenfield spent the first significant portion of his arguments to your Honor talking, again, about Mr. Johnson's innocence. Mr. Johnson is not innocent. The Court is not sentencing an innocent man. The Court is sentencing a murderer.

Just following up on that, your Honor. Mr. Greenfield suggested that perhaps this was an accident. Or perhaps the gun went off. And it is true. There was no witness that testified about the exact moment when Mr. Johnson murdered

Bernardo Garcia. But what we do know is that Gregory Reed and John Johnson burst into the lobby of that building. Gregory Reed immediately pulled out his gun and fired it as a warning shot while Luis Navarro ran off. Virtually immediately thereafter a bullet went right through the chest of Bernardo Garcia. So we can certainly draw inferences as to what happened even though nobody was there. And the only reasonable inference is that John Johnson, who had a gun, and was given a gun shortly before the robbery, pulled his gun out and shot it at Bernardo Garcia.

There is no testimony about a struggle. Ms. Garcia is right. There is no testimony that Mr. Garcia lunged towards

John Johnson and in a defensive maneuver John Johnson killed him. To the contrary. The testimony is what Ms. Garcia said, which is that Luis Navarro testified that Bernardo Garcia, they were playing quarters, and he was leaning over, and that's consistent with the crime scene evidence. And that's when he was murdered.

So this is not a preplanned murder but an intentional murder in the sense that John Johnson pulled his gun and killed Bernardo Garcia in cold blood.

And also, your Honor, the government's choosing to charge this as a 924(j) with no mandatory minimum has absolutely nothing to do with the government's belief or view of Mr. Johnson's guilt. There is no other available federal

murder charge for this conduct; 848(e), 21 United States Code 848(e) requires a murder during a (b)(1)(A) or a large scale drug trafficking crime. We didn't have evidence of that.

So the fact that this is a 924(j) crime with no mandatory minimum is because that is the only available murder charge in the federal system for the government. So that's absolutely not true.

As far as Mr. Johnson's background, the government agrees with, I'm sure, with what the Court mentioned and also what Mr. Greenfield said. He is nowhere as bad a background as Mr. Reed.

THE COURT: Bad a background meaning criminal history?

MR. BLANCHE: Criminal history. Correct, your Honor.

You're comparing apples to oranges. It appears that

Mr. Johnson was a drug dealer and that he got caught dealing

drugs both before and after he murdered Bernardo Garcia. So

that is a factor that, in theory, would weigh in favor of a

lower sentence.

However, on the other side of that is he's a lot different than Gregory Reed. Because the instant offense, Gregory Reed made a choice when he pulled his gun out and shot it. He, from all the testimony, shot a warning shot. Fired in the air. And as society should, society should treat that conduct different than what John Johnson did, which is pull out a gun and murder Bernardo Garcia.

So there's a difference between a person who fires a warning shot, or fires a shot in the air, versus somebody who fires right at somebody and kills him. So as it relates to the instant offense, in the government's view, and what happened inside the lobby, John Johnson was worse than Gregory Reed.

He wasn't the planner. He was a late recruit in that he was brought on after Mr. Reed and Mr. Gonzalez were recruited by Mr. Richardson.

But he didn't just walk in and commit the robbery. He was part of the plan. He met shortly before the robbery, about a mile away, at Hunts Point, where they talked about what they needed to do. He was given a gun by Gregory Reed up the block from the building. And he was one of the guys that went in.

So he is different than Gregory Reed in his background. He most certainly is. But what you also have, similar to Gregory Reed, is after this happened, after he committed a murder, he didn't change his life. And it appears that he had opportunity to do so. It appears that he has many members of his family who have jobs. His father was providing him a place to work. And he didn't. Indeed, he was arrested for drug dealing after the instant offense, your Honor.

THE COURT: But he was working as well.

MR. BLANCHE: Pardon me, your Honor?

THE COURT: Doesn't the presentence report indicate that he was also working at that same period of time?

MR. BLANCHE: Yes, your Honor. According to what
Mr. Johnson told the probation officer. And the government
doesn't have any information either way. He was working at
that time as well, while he was also selling drugs, your Honor.

So I don't think the Court can be comforted by what Mr. Johnson did after he committed this murder. This wasn't a wake-up call for him, where he's moved away and stopped committing crimes. The only evidence that we -- well, the evidence that we have is that he continued to deal drugs and indeed was arrested for dealing drugs after the instant offense.

So those are sad facts. And it's not something the government stands in front of the court happy. It's awful.

It's horrible that Mr. Johnson's family is here and is watching this proceeding happening. It's horrible that the Garcia family is here watching this proceeding happening.

But Mr. Johnson has to be held accountable. This murder was not committed by a young black kid. It was committed by John Johnson, your Honor.

And there's a reason why, in our society, and in the federal system, someone who goes to trial on a murder case faces life in prison. It's because it is, certainly federally, really the greatest crime.

THE COURT: Well, look, that's all true. But a person who stalks their victim and planned meticulously for months and

then committed the murder in the cruelest possible way would be looking at the same guidelines as Mr. Johnson, right?

MR. BLANCHE: Potentially, I -- yes. Certainly you can't go to jail for longer than life.

THE COURT: Level 43, right. I mean 43 is 43. That's what you get.

MR. BLANCHE: Correct. Although there's certainly circumstances where it can be more than life. There's certain gun charges that have to be consecutive. Your Honor's correct. There's some counts that carry mandatory life, and that's not this charge.

So I'm not saying that he's like every other murderer who is convicted and sentenced. But you also can't sentence somebody to more than life.

So in the government's view this is -- this is a very sad case. It's a sad case because Mr. Johnson is a young man. He was a young man when he committed this murder. And he's a young man today.

On the other hand, in the government's view, there is nothing before the Court, based upon his role in the offense, that warrants a nonguideline sentence, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Greenfield, anything you want to say in response?

MR. GREENFIELD: Just one thing, Judge. I'm sort of reminded of the conversation that takes place between

Johnson -- between Reed and Richardson right after the shooting takes place, where Reed says he doesn't want the kid to know what happened. If there was an intentional murder that took place and the young black kid did it, why would that be said?

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Johnson, you have a right to address the court, as I said. You don't have to, but you're certainly welcome to. And if you'd like to speak, now is the time.

THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to take a couple of minutes to think about what I've just heard. We'll resume in about five minutes and then I'll impose the sentence. Just if you want to use the restroom or get a drink you can, but in five minutes we'll resume.

Thank you.

(Recess)

THE COURT: Let me state the sentence I intend to impose and my reasons for it.

After that I'll ask the lawyers if there's any reason under the law that I can't impose that sentence. And if there is no legal impediment, then I'll formally impose the sentence at that point.

Mr. Johnson and to everyone who is here, our system requires judges to explain their sentence. And I think that's a good thing. I think it's -- this is an important day for

you, Mr. Johnson. It's an important day for your family. It's an important day for Mr. Garcia's family. This is something that weighs heavy on everybody. I'm very familiar and sensitive to that. So I think it's very important for me to explain what went into my thinking as to why the sentence I impose is the appropriate sentence.

This is a difficult case. I agree with what Ms. Garcia said, that two families have been very much destroyed by this crime.

I look at the Garcia family and I think that young man and all he might have been has been extinguished. We'll never know. And not only will we not know, his family will not have his presence ever again. They've been deprived of that.

That's the cruelest loss of all. And that requires punishment.

I look at the family members of Mr. Johnson. I think, Well, this is a family that's suffering too. I think about your child and others who are perhaps not here who are still very much victims of this crime. They didn't do anything wrong and yet they are going to be affected very much by this sentence. And that's heartbreaking. That's not right. That's not fair. But it is, sadly, the reality that comes with crimes being committed by individuals. The impact of the sentence on those individuals has great reach and it really makes a difference in the lives of people who desperately need their father or their brother or their loved one. That's — I wish

there was some way around that. But that is the reality. So that -- I just say that because I think it's important for everyone here, whether or not you have strong feelings about what the appropriate sentence will be, to understand that this is not something that's taken lightly. This is something that I and I think every judge in my place takes very, very seriously and weighs very, very carefully. The system is not supposed to be vindictive. It's not supposed to be reflexive. It's supposed to be deliberate and careful and thoughtful. And I've certainly thought a lot about this case.

On the one hand I look at Mr. Johnson and I think that he was 19 or so when he committed this crime. So he was quite, quite young. That's different than Mr. Reed. That's different than Mr. Richardson and Mr. Gonzalez. He was a very, very young man at the time he committed this crime. And young men do foolish and destructive things sometimes.

In addition his criminal history was, I think, very distinguishable from that of Mr. Reed, whom I sentenced yesterday. Mr. Reed had serious convictions for which he did serious time. Crimes of violence. And repeatedly. He was, just basically, every time he got out he committed more crimes.

Mr. Johnson committed some serious crimes, drug crimes. No crimes of violence that I'm aware of. But the drug crimes are serious and they do violence. Certainly selling crack to someone is destructive. It's destructive of that

individual's well-being and destructive of families and communities. So I don't mean to understate the significance and the moral culpability of selling drugs. And Mr. Johnson did that on three occasions that he got convicted for. But the sentences he received were relatively light: Two sentences of 30 days and one of approximately a year in which he got out sooner.

Mr. Johnson, after his release on the more serious drug crime, and that was a crime committed when he was about 20, appears that he's had no repeat connection to the criminal justice system other than the criminal trespass that's set forth at paragraph 42. The presentence report indicates he was working up until the time that he was arrested for this crime in 2011. That's not really corroborated. It's disappointing to me that the probation department didn't get corroboration. But they do seem to have very specific information about where he was working and when. And certainly the absence of additional convictions suggests that perhaps Mr. Johnson was starting to get it and perhaps he was going to mature out of the lifestyle that he put himself in as a young man.

So, those are the things that I think distinguish him from Mr. Reed. Of course, the other factor that distinguishes Mr. Johnson from Mr. Reed is that Mr. Johnson is the one -- the jury found it and I'm prepared to find it -- is the one who

pulled the trigger that killed Mr. Garcia. That makes him more culpable than Mr. Reed in terms of the conduct on the day of the murder and the robbery. And I think that can't be ignored either.

I think about the sentencing I had yesterday, and most of you weren't here for it, but Mr. Schneider, who is a very, very capable lawyer representing Mr. Reed argued for hope and the need for a person serving a lengthy jail sentence to have some hope and that they will return to their loved ones before they die. And I think as a general matter that's true. I didn't find that to be a persuasive argument yesterday with respect to Mr. Reed because of -- because of the extent, scope, and severity of his criminal conduct, which suggested to me that he really had forfeited any right to hope, at least to hope for being released from jail before his natural life.

I don't think Mr. Johnson is in that same category. I do think it's important that he have some hope and that he be able to return to his family at some point before his life expectancy is reached. But, there is no way I'm going to sentence Mr. Johnson to 20 years or anything close to it. The sentence I intend to impose is less than a life sentence but it's a 40-year sentence, which means with good behavior Mr. Johnson could be home in his late 50s or early 60s, and I think that's still a life. That's still an opportunity that Mr. Garcia will not have and that Mr. Garcia's family will feel

the loss of for the rest of their lives.

I don't mean to suggest that that's a light sentence. But it's less than what it could be. It's less than what Mr. Reed received. And it's less than what the government and perhaps others have asked for.

I think it's an appropriate sentence in light of all those things I just talked about. But I don't for a moment want anyone to think that I don't -- I don't recognize the loss of the Garcia family. It is tragic and it's irreversible. And it happened to Mr. Garcia and to his family.

So I intend to impose a 40-year sentence. It will be 20 years each on Counts One and Two and 40 years on Count Three, to run concurrently.

I will impose a term of supervised release of three years on Counts One and Two, and five years on Count Three, all to run concurrently.

I will not impose a fine. I don't think there's really any ability to pay a fine.

The government is not seeking forfeiture so I'm not going to order forfeiture.

The government has not sought restitution, I don't think, either.

So I will order, however, a \$300 special assessment.

There is standards and conditions associated with supervised release. I will impose those. So if and when

Mr. Johnson is released, he will have to abide by the conditions that are set forth at pages 17 and 18 of the presentence report. I'll announce them when I impose the sentence formally. But that is what they are.

Okay. Is there any legal impediment to my imposing that sentence, Mr. Blanche?

MR. BLANCHE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Greenfield?

MR. GREENFIELD: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Johnson would you please stand.

Mr. Johnson, having received the jury's verdict of guilty on all three counts of the indictment, I now sentence you as follows.

I sentence you to a term of incarceration of 20 years each on Counts One and Two, and 40 years on Count Three, each to run concurrently. Those terms will be followed by a term of supervised release of three years on Counts One and Two, five years on Count Three, also to run concurrently. The supervised release will include the following standard mandatory and special conditions.

First you shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime.

You shall not illegally possess a controlled substance of any kind, that's marijuana, that's prescription drugs for

which you don't have a prescription, that's any controlled substance.

You shall not, of course, possess a firearm or a destructive device of any kind.

You shall also cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer.

There are 13 standard conditions of supervised release that are imposed in virtually every case involving supervision. I will impose those here.

I will also impose the following special conditions.

First, that you will participate in a program approved by the probation office which will include testing to determine whether you're using drugs or alcohol. That will be a treatment program with testing. The court — I authorize the treatment provider to provide information and the results of tests to probation. And I authorize probation to share information with the treatment provider so that each can be aware of how you are doing and whether or not you're complying with the terms of your supervision, whether or not you're complying with the terms of the program that you're associated with.

You will be required to contribute to the costs of that program to the extent you can afford to. So if you're working and can help defray the costs, you should do that. If you're not working but you have access to insurance, public or

private insurance, to cover those costs, then you'll be expected to cover those costs through the insurance that you have. If you don't have any access to payment, then the Court will bear those costs because it's important and required that you get that treatment.

All right. You'll also be — the probation report is asking for alcohol aftercare treatment program which I think is really what I'm authorizing here is drugs and alcohol. To the extent that there are separate programs, then that's fine. But the fact is you'll be tested. You'll get tested to see whether you're using drugs and alcohol.

You will provide the probation officer with any requested financial information.

You will also submit your residence, your place of business, your vehicle, or any other premises that you control to a search in the event that the probation officer thinks that there might be evidence of a crime or evidence of a violation of your supervised release within those premises. So you have to agree that you will be subject to a search when probation thinks a search is appropriate. The search would have to be done in a reasonable manner and at a reasonable time. But if you declined to allow that search, then that would be a violation of your supervised release and you would be resentenced. So you have to allow that.

Another thing you have to do is you have to notify the

people with whom you share premises. If you're living with a relative or a friend, you have to tell them that you are subject to the search requirement so that they understand that if they commingle their things with yours, then their things could be searched too. By giving them that notice, you'll give them the opportunity to protect their own privacy rights. All right. So you have to let them know that.

I am going to direct that you report to the nearest probation office within 24 hours of your release from custody. However, if it's a weekend, then the next business day. Okay. But you should — so when you get out, you should come home. Have a nice meal with your family. But then the next day I want you to go to the probation office will be in this courthouse. And then immediately begin reporting and abiding by the conditions of your supervised release.

As I said, I'm not going to impose a fine.

I am going to impose a three hundred dollar special assessment, one hundred dollars for each count of conviction.

Are there any recommendations you'd like me to make, Mr. Greenfield?

MR. GREENFIELD: Yes, your Honor.

He asked that he be incarcerated within the -- somewhere within the northeast region of the United States. Bureau of Prisons of Northeast Region.

THE COURT: All right. So I'll recommend that. I

can't order that. But I'll recommend that it be somewhere in the northeast so your family is able to visit you more easily. So I will make that recommendation. Okay.

All right. There are no open counts, Mr. Blanche?
MR. BLANCHE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Johnson I should tell you, you have a right to appeal this sentence. I think you're already contemplating an appeal. I've appointed Mr. Neuman to assist with that appeal. But you need to file a notice of appeal within two weeks. Probably two weeks from tomorrow when I issue the judgment.

So talk to your lawyers about filing that notice. I think they're on it. But that's something that I think you'll have to do.

Have a seat.

Let me say this to Mr. Johnson's family. That's a long sentence. I'm not oblivious to that. That's a hard sentence on you too. I'd ask you to continue to support him. He's going to need your support more than ever. So write to him. Visit him. Be a part of his life.

And Mr. Johnson, I will urge you to remember that the fact that you are incarcerated for a lengthy term doesn't mean that you can't maintain relationships with people, with your family members, those who are here today and others who really are depending on you, including your child.

So take that seriously. Do everything in your power to make sure that you can be a father and you can be a friend and relative to people who count on you. I think it's in your interests to do that as well.

And I want you also to reflect on what happened here and the loss that the Garcia family is experiencing everyday.

And to, finally, the Garcia family, I don't know whether you came here with a sense as to what you thought would be an appropriate sentence. It may have been the case that you thought anything less than a life sentence would somehow disrespect you and your son. I hope you don't feel that.

The sentence I imposed is what I think is the appropriate one in light of all the factors. I've explained it. I don't expect everyone to agree with me. But I hope that everyone at least -- at least everyone recognizes that it was a process that was deliberate and careful and thoughtful and I did the best I could to hand out a just sentence.

I wish you the best. It's going to be difficult always for you. And I hope that you'll find it in your heart to forgive those responsible because I think ultimately that's probably the best for you as well.

But I hope that -- look, we have two families here today. I hope you'll be respectful of each other's pain and what you're going through, and I hope that on the way out you'll be mindful of that.

So let me thank the marshals. Let me thank the court reporter. And let me thank the attorneys for their efforts in this case. Okay. Good luck to your, Mr. Johnson. Thanks. (Adjourned)